



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/322,333	05/28/1999	TAKESHI KONDO	1217-990766	7839
7590	03/14/2003			
RUSSELL D ORKIN 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURG, PA 152191818			EXAMINER	
			ZIRKER, DANIEL R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1771		
		DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003		

24

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Examiner	Group Art Unit

*GL*  
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE -3- MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/3/02

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.**

**Disposition of Claims**

Claim(s) 5-8 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 5-8 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

**Application Papers**

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)**

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received  
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment(s)**

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 20  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Office Action Summary**

Art Unit 1711

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention. More particularly, applicants' recent Declaration by co-inventor Nagamoto in which he points out on page 2, second paragraph of the Declaration that two embodiments of the invention which are set forth in the specification at page 7, lines 19 and 20, apparently do not work, despite the fact that the specification teaches that these two embodiments (as well as many others) are particularly suitable. Accordingly, the Examiner can only note that since applicants' most recent Declaration apparently contradicts an essential portion of his specification that the provided specification fails to meet the mandate of 35 U.S.C. §

Art Unit 1711

112, first paragraph, as failing to teach how to make and to use the invention.

4. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being based upon a defective specification.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over either JP 11-016863 or JP 10-189504. Each of these references appears to disclose <sup>the claimed methods,</sup> ~~an~~ as was noted by the Japanese Examiner in paragraph No. 2 of his Japanese Patent Report of which the Examiner does not have a translation but has become aware of the substance. Briefly, the references, of which the Examiner has also been able to obtain machine translations thereof, appear to teach the same semiconductor grinding method as applicants claim using <sup>pressure sensitive</sup> ~~an~~ adhesive layer coated onto a base film which meets the performance parameters set forth in applicants' claims, or otherwise would be at most a routine optimization for one of ordinary skill, motivated by the expectation of achieving an improved grinding technique for the

Art Unit 1711

semiconductor wafers. Whatever parameters that are not believed to be either expressly or inherently disclosed are each believed to be obvious modifications for one of ordinary skill, in the absence of unexpected results.

7. The Examiner has withdrawn his prior art rejection based upon EP -355 in view of the aforementioned Declaration of co-inventor Nagamoto.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Dzirker:cdc

March 11, 2003

DANIEL ZIRKER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300  
1700

